Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary O9/847,384	Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
All Participants: Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection (1) Patrick T. Lewis. (3)		09/847,384	HOVINEN ET AL.
All Participants: (1) Patrick T. Lewis. (2) James Lydon. (4) Date of Interview: 5 March 2004 Type of Interview: 5 March 2004 Type of Interview:		Examiner	Art Unit
(1) Patrick T. Lewis. (2) James Lydon. (4) Date of Interview: 5 March 2004 Time: 12:00 Type of Interview: 6 March 2004 Time: 12:00 Type of Interview: Applicant Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: USC 112, first and second paragraphs Claims discussed: 14-32 Prior art documents discussed: Latva et al. Journal of Luminescence (1997), Vol. 75, pages 149-169. Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		Patrick T. Lewis	1623
(2) James Lydon. (4) Date of Interview: 5 March 2004 Time: 12:00 Type of Interview:	All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n: Non-Final Rejection
Date of Interview: 5 March 2004 Type of Interview: 12:00 Type of Int	(1) <u>Patrick T. Lewis</u> .	(3)	
Type of Interview: Telephonic Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: USC 112, first and second paragraphs Claims discussed: 14-32 Prior art documents discussed: Latva et al. Journal of Luminescence (1997), Vol. 75, pages 149-169. Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet	(2) <u>James Lydon</u> .	(4)	
Telephonic	Date of Interview: <u>5 March 2004</u>	Time: <u>12:00</u>	
Rejection(s) discussed: USC 112, first and second paragraphs Claims discussed: 14-32 Prior art documents discussed: Latva et al. Journal of Luminescence (1997), Vol. 75, pages 149-169. Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III.	☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No	cant's representative)	
USC 112, first and second paragraphs Claims discussed: 14-32 Prior art documents discussed: Latva et al. Journal of Luminescence (1997), Vol. 75, pages 149-169. Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III.	Part I.		
Prior art documents discussed: Latva et al. Journal of Luminescence (1997), Vol. 75, pages 149-169. Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III.			
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III.		<i>9</i> -169.	
Part III.	Part II.		
	SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
It is not necessary for applicant to married	Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interdirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 	of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r	e examiner will provide a v	vritten summary of the substance
Mitue So	Mitu. In		
Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Poprassiti	Circuit

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and Mr. Lydon discussed several possible amendments to the claims in order to put the case in condition for allowance; however, no agreement could be met. Mr. Lydon was agreeable to several of the examiners's suggestions (the examiner also showed efforts to compromise), but no agreement could be reached in regards to the scope of the variable G as instantly claimed..